



DSW

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Tokuro OZAWA

Group Art Unit: 2672

Application No.: 10/779,728

Examiner: J. AMINI

Filed: February 18, 2004

Docket No.: 118458

For: ELECTRO-OPTICAL PANEL, DRIVING CIRCUIT AND DRIVING METHOD FOR
DRIVING ELECTRO-OPTICAL PANEL, AND ELECTRONIC APPARATUS

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Further to the March 16, 2006 personal interview with Examiner Amini, and in reply to the January 9, 2006 Office Action and, reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks. Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Amini at the personal interview held on March 16 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated in the remarks below and constitute the record of the interview.

I. Formal Matters

The Office Action, within the context of the §103(a) rejection, requires Applicant to specify voltage levels on page 4, lines 5-7 of the Office Action; requires elaboration of claim 3 on page 4, lines 19-22 of the Office Action; requires elaboration of claim 4 on page 5, lines

19-20 to page 6, lines 1-2 of the Office Action; and requires elaboration of claim 7 on page 6, lines 8-9 of the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's requirement to specify voltage levels. Specifically, Applicant asserts that it is not necessary to specify voltage levels since such information is not required for one skilled in the art to understand and appreciate the claimed invention.

Regarding the Office Action's requirement for elaboration on claims 3, 4, and 7, Applicant respectfully asserts that elaboration on claim 3 can be found in paragraphs [0014] to [0015] of the present specification; elaboration on claim 4 can be found in paragraphs [0016] to [0017] of the present specification; and elaboration on claim 7 can be found in paragraphs [0021] to [0023] of the present specification.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the requirements within the context of the §103(a) rejection.

II. 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because it is not clear what the term "switching" refers to, since elements such as a transistor, a diode, a capacitor, or any combination thereof are considered to be a switch. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Specifically, Applicant asserts that it would be clear to one skilled in the art that a "switching" element does not refer to a diode, a capacitor, or a combination thereof (see Figure 2, items TR4 and TR5, and page 11, paragraph [0061] of the present specification). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the §112, second paragraph, rejection.

III. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwafuchi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0096994), in view of Hack (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0030647), and further in view of Watanabe (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,897). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Specifically, Applicant asserts that Iwafuchi, Hack, or Watanabe do not disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, an electro-optical panel including at least pixels provided in association with intersections of data lines and the scanning lines, wherein the pixels each include at least an inverting device that outputs an output signal obtained by inverting an input signal, as recited in independent claims 1-3 and 10.

Iwafuchi discloses a crystal growth layer that is disposed in a state vertically inverted from a state at the time of crystal growth (see paragraph [0236] of Iwafuchi). Iwafuchi, however, fails to disclose an electro-optical panel including at least pixels provided in association with intersections of data lines and the scanning lines, wherein the pixels each include at least an inverting device that outputs an output signal obtained by inverting an input signal, as recited in claims 1-3 and 10.

Hack discloses a current sensor circuit that is used for calibrating a circuit by converting the current signal from each column into a corresponding voltage signal (see Figure 2 and paragraph [0038] of Hack). Accordingly, Hack also fails to disclose an electro-optical panel including at least pixels provided in association with intersections of data lines and the scanning lines, wherein the pixels each include at least an inverting device that outputs an output signal obtained by inverting an input signal, as recited in claims 1-3 and 10.

Watanabe discloses a schematic diagram (Figure 12, column 13, lines 26-28 of Watanabe) of a delay circuit of an input section in a liquid crystal display device for

illustrating exact synchronization of the video signals with the sampling pulses by changing the delaying time of the sampled pulses, including inverters for delaying pulses. Watanabe, however, does not disclose an electro-optical panel including at least pixels provided in association with intersections of data lines and the scanning lines, wherein the pixels each include at least an inverting device that outputs an output signal obtained by inverting an input signal, as recited in claims 1-3 and 10, and therefore fails to make up for the deficiencies of Iwafuchi and Hack.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Iwafuchi, Hack, or Watanabe do not disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, an electro-optical panel including at least pixels provided in association with intersections of data lines and the scanning lines, wherein the pixels each include at least an inverting device that outputs an output signal obtained by inverting an input signal, as recited in independent claims 1-3 and 10.

In accordance with the above remarks. Applicant submits that independent claims 1-3 and 10 define patentable subject matter. Claims 4-9 and 11-14 depend from claims 2, 3, and 10, respectively, and therefore, also define patentable subject matter, as well as for the additional features they recite. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the §103(a) rejection.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Bogdan A. Zinchenko
Registration No. 57,473

JAO:BAZ/hs

Date: April 7, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--